COMMENT RESOLUTION

SD-1 COORDINATION FOR:
DRAFT MIL-STD-2500A, NOTICE 1
DRAFT MIL-STD-188-199 NOTICE 1
DRAFT MIL-STD-XXXX,

		draft MIL-STD-2500A NOTICE 1	
	LOCATION	**COMMENT**	**RESOLUTION**
1	55, TPXCD	Should the *note on page 54 referencing back to Table IV(A), field TPXCD also be modified to reflect the maximum of two bytes sizing? Proposed text: *The length of the TPXCD field is next highest number of bytes which can contain the number of bits identified in the TPXCDLNTH field, to a maximum of two bytes.	Suggested Comment Accepted
2	60, table V	Essential. Add Footnote: "NO CONRACT, WNINTEL, and NOFORN security control markings will only be used through 1999." Rationale: According to the 1996 edition of DCID 1/7, the NOCONTRACT, WNINTEL, and NOFORN caveats have been eliminated. Computer based systems have three years to implement the changes.	Essential Comment Accepted
3	118, B.4.2	Addresses for Director CIO and Commander JITC need to be spaced further apart to clarify the two different addresses.	Suggested Comment Accepted
4	119, 5.5.c	Add sentence (and procedure to concur) following the second sentence. "Recorded expiration dates will be included as part of the NITFS Tagged record Extensions Register on-line document." Rationale: No mechanism for notifying the user of pending expiration is outlined in this document.	Essential Comment Accepted
5	119, 5.5.e	First sentence. Omit "a" between "this is" and "associated with the file."	Suggested Comment Accepted
6	119, B.5.2.c	First sentence. Same error as number 4. (DMA item #4 is: Omit "a" between "this is" and "associated with the file.")	Suggested Comment Accepted
7	120, B.5.3.b	Change "CETAGs" to "DESTAGs." This change seems appropriate based upon consistency with the requirements in paragraphs B.5.1g and B.5.2e.	Essential Comment Accepted with Modification - A rewrite is required to clarify RETAGS, DESTAGS and CETAGS
8	121	Since "DC" is no longer the Preparing Activity, it should be listed as a Review Activity.	Suggested Comment Accepted
9	General	Since the changes to MIL-STD-188-199 specifically removes the A suffix from this document number (MIL-STD-2500A and MIL-HDBK-1300) within the reference listing, should this document not be renumbered as MIL-STD-2500, or are the recommended changes to MIL-STD-188-199 incorrect?	Suggested Comment not Accepted
10	General	Concur as written.	
11	General	We have reviewed MIL-STD-2500A Notice 1 and MIL-STD-188-199 Notice 1 and have no comments to offer.	
12	General	Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence - Topo Team submits "no comments."	

	LOCATION	COMMENT	RESOLUTION
13	General	Moving the registered and controlled tags to a NTB controlled Register is an excellent idea. However, the Tag Register's procedures/policy as to it's operation and CM are not fully developed and mature enough to allow approval of this CR to 2500A. Specific comments as outlined below. 1.) Presently only a draft Register (dated December 1995) is available. Typical of drafts, many items in this version are incomplete, such as status of tags, controlled vs. registered, deletion of OBE tags, addition of tag specification details, authoring organization and POC, pointers for more information, etc. It is a little premature to approve any CR that moves the tags until the New Tag Register is complete and properly reviewed by the community. Also the specific mechanisms that will be used to disseminate the tag register to the community should be identified with a transition plan and schedule of when the Register will be "online". (All configuration control boards that I am aware of require complete and accurate RFC's, not drafts, before anything is approved.) 2.) A Tag Register Management Plan is needed to detail the procedures, policy, and responsibilities of how this new process is going to work. 3.) CM responsibilities are not specifically identified, but should be. Otherwise it is not clear who is going to control NITF tags and by what means. This is an important section and should be listed as a separate paragraph such as B4.X or 5.X Configuration Management. The CM responsibilities and process needs to be identified before removal from DISA Mil Stds/control. Will the Tag Register have CM identification information or will the tags capture all CM information?? 4.) Applicable Documents section of 2500A needs to be updated to include the Tag Register document.	Essential Comment Accepted - Action assigned to Format Working Group to deal with these issues.

draft MIL-STD-188-199 NOTICE 1

	LOCATION	COMMENT	RESOLUTION
14	4, 2.2	Change: "NY, NY" to "New York, NY" Rationale: "NY" should be reserved for the state code. Inconsistent with name for New York City on page 23, section 6.5 ("New York")	Suggested Comment Accepted
15	5, 3.1.e	Change: "C3I" to "C4I" Change: "Command, Control, Communication, and Intelligence" to "Command, Control, Communication, Computers, and Intelligence" Rationale: C3I has been changed to C4I in the DOD lexicon.	Suggested Comment Not Accepted
16	5, 3.1.h & i	Change: Please switch item "h" with item "i" and item "i" with item "h" Rationale: Not in alphabetical order.	Suggested Comment Accepted
17	11	Equation #2, denominator of equation: Change "isize / vsize x code_size" to "[(isize / vsize) x code_size]" Rationale: Parentheses and brackets provide clarity as to the equation's order of operations.	Essential Comment Accepted
18	11, 4.4 15, 5.2.2	Paragraphs 4.4 and 5.2.2. The use of the acronyms "NITF" and "NITFS" appears confused. In paragraph 4.4, the change request submitter makes a change from NITF to NITFS with regard to the implementation of VQ. In the same paragraph, the change to NITFS is not addressed when referring to implementation of VQ. Paragraph 5.2.2 contains virtually the same change, but does not include the change from NITF to NITFS in the sentence. The submitter may have made a typographical error in the original DD Form 1426.	Essential Comment Accepted - "S" deleted from NITFS on page 11.

	LOCATION	COMMENT	RESOLUTION
19	12	Equation #4, result of actual compression ratio calculation: Change: "24.49:1" to "24.42:1" Rationale: Actual calculations reveal a result of "24.4202..." rather than "24.49"	Essential Comment Accepted - Also change theoretical compression ratio from 32 to 32:1
20	23, 6.5	Line 3 Change: "New York, New York" to "New York, NY" Rationale: Consistent addressing conventions, official state mailing abbreviation	Suggested Comment Accepted
21	General	See item 6. In the comments on MIL-STD-2500. Otherwise, concur with all other change recommendations. (DMA's item 6 in the comments on MIL-STD-2500 was : Since the changes to MIL-STD-188-199 specifically removes the A suffix from this document number (MIL-STD-2500A and MIL-HDBK-1300) within the reference listing, should this document not be renumbered as MIL-STD-2500, or are the recommended changes to MIL-STD-188-199 incorrect?	Suggested Comment Not Accepted
22	General	Does NITFS use 4-digit year formats throughout for dates?	Suggested Comment Not Accepted
23	General	Concur as written.	
24	General	Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence - Topo Team submits "no comments."	
25	General	We have reviewed MIL-STD-2500A Notice 1 and MIL-STD-188-199 Notice 1 and have no comments to offer.	

draft MIL-STD-XXXX, TFS			
	LOCATION	COMMENT	RESOLUTION
26	Foreward	Document missing FOREWARD section	The author accepted all of the comments. A new draft will be submitted for validation testing. It will go through another round of SD-1 coordination if testing yields significant comments. The document will proceed to the ISMC as approved with modifications.
27	TOC	Make following change to Table of Contents: Now reads: Figure 2. Long Parameters...................Page 5 Change to: Figure 2. Long Parameters...................Page 6 Reason for recommendation: During review, unable to find Figure 2 on page 5.	
28	TOC	There are errors in the table of contents. Paragraph 3.2.2, concerning the definition for Computer Fusion Metafile, has been deleted. As a result, paragraphs 3.2.3, 3.2.4, and 3.2.5 in the table of contents are paragraphs 3.2.2, 3.2.3 and 3.2.4 in the text.	
29	1, 1.1	Essential. This paragraph should address TFS and DES since these topics are addressed in the title of the standard. The relationship between CFM and TFS is ambiguous. Is there some overriding reason to preserve a distinction between TFS and CFM? If so, the distinction needs to be clarified. If not, recommend removal of all references to CFM.	
30	1, 1.1 & 1.2	Since the term "Computer Fusion Metafile" was removed from these paragraphs, "Computer Fusion Metafile (CFM)" should be removed from the document title.	
31	1, 1.3	If "Secondary Imagery Dissemination Systems (SIDS)" is no longer an acceptable term, then a different term should be used here. The term "SIDS" has already been dropped from the acronym list in paragraph 3.1.	
32	1,1.3	Paragraph 1.3. Change "MIL-HDBK-1300" to "MIL-HDBK-1300A." The update is referred to in paragraph 2.1.1.	

	LOCATION	COMMENT	RESOLUTION
33	1, 1.3	Suggested. Remove all ties to SIDS as this is being done in other related MIL-STD.	The author accepted all of the comments.
34	1, 1.3	Suggested. MIL-HDBK-1300 should be MIL-HDBK-1300A.	
35	1, 1.4	Suggested. Recommend the compliance requirements be incorporated with this standard as an appendix. Testing for these requirements will be produced as part of the validation testing process for the proposed standard.	
36	1, 1.3	The words 'Secondary' and 'SIDS' cannot be removed without removing the entire sentence. Rationale: Sentence comes directly from the memo stated and cannot be changed.	
37	1, 1.3 4, 3.1	The MIL-STD-2500 and MIL-STD-188-199 are being changed to omit references to Secondary Imagery Dissemination System (SIDS) and SID. Recommend the references in this draft document be omitted, specifically to paragraphs 1.3 and 3.1	
38	2, 2.1	Put "A" after 2500 and 1300. Rationale: current version	
39	2, 2.1.2	Delete "/TCBD" from "(Copies of DISA/JIEO Circular 9008 may be obtained from DISA/JIEO/JITC/TCBD, Fort Huachuca AZ. 85613-7020	
40	2, 2.1.1	Suggested. MIL-STD-2500 should be MIL-STD-2500A; date 18 June 1993 should be 12 October 1994.	
41	2, 2.1.1	Suggested. MIL-HDBK-1300 should be MIL-STD-1300A; date 18 June 1993 should be 12 October 1994.	
42	2, 2.1.1	Remove publication dates under each of the standards listed. No date implies the current issue.	
43	2, 2.1.2	Suggested. Update JITC address to not show JIEO or office code, just make it generic JITC. Recommend change: "(Copies of DISA/JIEO Circular 9008 may be obtained from DISA/JITC, Fort Huachuca, AZ 85613-7020)".	
44	4, item c	Change: "C3I" to "C4I" Change: "Command, Control, Communication, and Intelligence" to "Command, Control, Communication, Computers, and Intelligence" Rationale: C3I has been changed to C4I in the DOD lexicon.	
45	4, item ee	Insert: Put in new entry for "DES Data Extension Segment" Rationale: Acronym is used in document	
46	4, item g	Change: "DoD" to "DOD" Rationale: Official designation for Department of Defense is all caps.	
47	4, 3.1	Suggested. Document addresses DES, therefore DES should be added to the Acronyms list.	
48	4, 3.1	Suggested. NITFS reads "National Imagery Transmission Format Standards", should be National Imagery Transmission Format Standard".	
49	5, 3.2.4	Capitalize T in "the" at the beginning of the second sentence.	
50	5, 3.3.1	Suggested. Reads "is an unsigned integer between" for clarity should be "is represented by an unsigned 8-bit integer between".	
51	6, Figure 2	Essential. The high order words should be labeled bits 16 thru 32, not 0 thru 15. This will allow the user to understand by visualization of figure 2 what the bit order is. See ISO/IEC 8632-3, part 3, page 10 for example.	
52	6, 3.3.4	Suggested. For consistency with paragraphs 3.3.2 and 3.3.3, the following note should be added to the end of the paragraph: "Note, this also is known as the "Big-Endian" or "Network Byte Order" representation for 64 bit reals."	The author accepted all of the comments.

	LOCATION	COMMENT	RESOLUTION
53	6, 3	Essential. The high order words should be labeled bits 32 thru 47 and 48 thru 63, not 0 thru 15 and 16 thru 31.This will allow the user to understand by visualization of figure 3 what the bit order is. See ISO/IEC 8632-3, part 3, page 10 for example.	
54	6, 3.3.5	Essential. In order to avoid confusion, the term "ASCII 0", (i.e. number 0, ASCII 48) should be stated as "ASCII null byte 0". This must be done for consistency and clarity with other paragraphs.	
55	6, 3.3.5	Change the second to last sentence to read, "If the string does not end on a 16 bit word boundary, a single null byte (0) shall be appended to the end of the string."	
56	7, 4.1	Suggested. Line 13, "Each TFS metafile, transport, and profile state contains security, metadata, and an associated index into the next level." Line 6 mentions the same information for the Transport, "The Transport Descriptor commands describe the security, metadata, and index into the transport body components." For consistency, line 4, which reads "The TFS Metafile Descriptor commands describing the overall structure of the TFS, the TFS version, subscription, configuration, and an index into the TFS substate components are found in this state.", should read " The TFS Metafile Descriptor commands describing the overall structure of the TFS, the TFS security, metadata, version, subscription, configuration, and an index into the TFS substate components are found in this state." Additionally, line 13 which reads "Each TFS metafile, transport, and profile state contains security, metadata, and an associated index into the next level.", should read "The TFS profile state contains security, metadata, and an associated index into the next level." The paragraph is not clear and consistent, the changes will make it more understandable. Also, recommend breaking the paragraph into several subparagraphs to enhance clarity and readability.	
57	7, 4.1	Delete the "r" from "actural" on line 11. Delete the "s" from the end of "profiles" and "transports" on lines 12 and 13. In line 4, the sequence of TFS Metafile Descriptor commands does not include all of the commands listed in paragraph 4.2b, which groups the commands by command class. Security, Metadata and CONFIG DATA should be included in the sequence. In line 9, the sentence "The profile body contains objects, actions, or other nested profiles" needs to be rewritten. It does not logically lead to paragraph 4.2e, which refers to PROFILE ACTION and PROFILE OBJECT as *Profile Commands*. These commands are distinct from the Delimiter and Descripter commands referred to up until this point in the paragraph.	
58	8, 4	Change "an" to "a" in the last sentence prior to NITF. Rationale: grammatically correct.	
59	8, 4.3	Essential. Line 13, the "can contain values up to one gigabyte (1,073,741,823) for the full CPL". MIL-STD-2500A Table 1, page 20, states the size of the NUMDES cannot exceed 999,999,999 for the entire file size. A compromise will have to be worked out so that the CPL and overall CFM file do not exceed 999,999,999. Also break paragraph up into subparagraphs for clarity.	
60	8, 4.4	If commands enclosed in brackets are optional, what happens to commands that only have a bracket on one side? Are single brackets used to denote the beginning and end of commands? If so, why is there no bracket after the END TFS command? Are there really supposed to be two brackets on the right side of the final END PROFILE command? The bracket notation needs to be explained better in the text.	The author accepted all of the comments.

	LOCATION	COMMENT	RESOLUTION

61	10, 2	Essential. Table 2 shows that the BEGIN TRANSPORT BODY, BEGIN PROFILE BODY, END PROFILE, END TRANSPORT, AND END TFS all have a CPL of "0", but they are not shown in table form. There should be a table for consistency. What should it look like?
		
		`|   TS   |   TSS   |   or   |   TS   |   TSS   |`
		`|       CPL=0       |`	

62	11, 5.1.1.4	Add a space between "commands" and "with."	
63	12, 5.1.2.4	Change "consist" to "consists" in the third sentence.	
64	13, table 8	Why were the terms CONNECTION_TYPE and CONNECTION_CONFIG dropped from the table?	
65	14, 5.1.2.6	Change "consist" to "consists" in second sentence. Change "CONFIGURATION value 0" to "CONFIGURATION value is 0."	
66	14, 5.1.2.8 & table 11	The term "long index offset," the table values "LONG_OFFSET_WORD_1" and "LONG_OFFSET_WORD_2," and how they are related and used is not made clear the text. An explanation of the INDEX command could also help the reader understand its purpose and what advantage may be gained by using the INDEX command.	
67	17, 5.1.5.3	Change "object_type=1" on 5th line to "OBJECT_TYPE=1." Change "object_type=2" on the 6th line to "OBJECT_TYPE=2." These refer to a value in a field that has already been described in paragraph 5.1.2.4.1, and clearly tie in with the reference to the "OBJECT_TYPE field referred to within the paragraph itself. Making this change will reduce the confusion in the interpretation of the paragraph.	
68	12, 5.1.2.3 16, 5.1.3.2 16, 5.1.3.3 16, 5.1.4.2 16, 5.1.4.3 17, 5.1.5.2	Suggested. "commands with associated TS and TSS" for ease of reading should read "commands see Tables 3 and 4 with associated TS and TSS".	
69	General	Change "NITFS" to "NITF" from section 3 to the end of the document. Rationale: grammatically correct.	
70	General	General question: Where in the document is there mention of time stamp and does it use 4-digit years? Does NITFS use 4-digit years throughout for dates?	
71	General	Suggested. Standard would benefit from having a non-narrative appendix that addresses the Concept of Use and several examples of potential applications.	
72	General	Suggested. Standard as it stands does not appear to be implementable in a fashion that enables IOP between users. It alludes to establishing profiles for implementation. Guidance should be provided on generating profiles, perhaps a model profile and info on where to register profiles.	
73	General	Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence - Topo Team submits "no comments."	